



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.    | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 09/774,577  | 02/01/2001  | Akira Oosawa         | Q61225                 | 5559             |
| 7590 01/31/2005   |             | EXAMINER             |                        |                  |
| SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC                   |             |                      | AZARIAN, SEYED H       |                  |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.<br>WASHINGTON. DC 20037-3213 |             |                      | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   | .,          |                      | 2625                   |                  |
|   |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 01/31/200 | 5                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/774,577  | OOSAWA, AKIRA   |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |
|  | Seyed Azarian   | 2625  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |   |   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  |   |   |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | PLY [check either a) or b)]   |   |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |   |   |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI | f the final rejection.<br>E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |   |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the<br>issues for appeal; and/or  |   |   |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |   |   |  |  |  |
| NOTE:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.   | ` '   |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would<br/>canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | be allowable if submitted in a s                                      | eparate, timely filed amendment                       |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w   |   |   |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-69.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   | •   |   |  |  |  |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ Other:   |   |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |  |  |  |

Continuation of 5. Does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: refer to claims 63 and 64, Kano teaches displaying images, which can "provide information" to be viewed by the radiologist as a final data output, along with the original image fo comparison (column 14, lines 17-46), also Examiner indicates, Fig. 15A, 15B and 16A, 16B, pair of same images for a particular patient where the earlier image was taken two years earlier, and difference image is shown, which the existence of various artifacts in this figure is prominent due to the mismatch of the anatomical features, also Fig. 16A shows the difference in amount of cardiomegaly, same imag (identical), taken two years earlier, (column 13, lines 21-46). It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (patients name or identification and time periods) are not recited in the rejected claims 63 and 64.

BHAVESH M. MEHTA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600